75. (New) The method of Claim 40, wherein said axis substantially lies within a plane of a screen of said display.

76. (New) The method of Claim 40, wherein said axis is substantially normal to a plane of a screen of said display.

REMARKS

Claims 1-76 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 have been amended for clarification. The support for the amendment of Claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 is found in Figures 4 (upper right), 9A, 9B, 10A, 10B, 11A, and 11B.

Claims 53-76 are newly added. The support for Claims 53-56, 59-62, 65-68, and 71-74 is found in Figures 4 (upper right), 9A, 9B, 10A, 10B, 11A, and 11B. The support for Claims 57, 63, 69, and 75 is found in Figures 10A, 10B, 11A, and 11B. The support for Claims 58, 64, 70, and 76 is found in Figures 4 (upper right), 9A, and 9B.

Commonly understood geometric terminology has been used in the description of features from the drawing figures that have been incorporated into the new claims and into the amended claims. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, 14, 18-19, 23-25, 27, 31-32, 36-38, 40, 44-45, and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goh, U.S. Patent No. 5,678,015.

The reference must teach every element of the claim for anticipation (unless the element is inherent). MPEP § 2131.

Applicant's invention provides a more informative and useful method of identifying selectable options in a user interface.

Applicant's invention recites "at least two selectable targets displayed on at least a portion of said display" and "all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display capable of being simultaneously displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while each one of said all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display remains continuously selectable during said simulated rotation " (claims 1, 14, 27, and 40).

Applicant recites that each one of said all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display remains continuously selectable during said simulated rotation. Support for this is found on page 21, lines 3-9, of the specification and in figures 4, 9A, 9B, 10A, 10B, 11A, and 11B.

Goh discloses a rotatable six sided cube, each face of the cube being able to display a window (col. 4, lines 31-34; col. 3, lines 61-64). The faces are translucent so that all six faces are visible to a user simultaneously (col. 4, lines 31-35). If effect, as shown in Figures 4-6, overlapping images of the faces are presented to the viewer. Goh is not clear on how selection of a window or icon is performed, but discloses that a window (corresponding to a face) is selectable by a user (col. 5, lines 40-41). Goh discloses that the rotation pattern is such that each face of the cube is displayed as normal to the user's line of sigh once during each rotation cycle (col. 5, 42-48), suggesting that there is more than one axis of rotation. When a window is selected by the user, it becomes opaque. The user may select, add, delete, or launch icons (col. 6, lines 2-5).

As Goh does not disclose how a window (or face) is selected in the case where overlapping windows (or faces) are shown, it is not known how this is accomplished. Presumably, the user must rotate a face such that it is the top image layer and then select it. Thus, the targets (whether a window or an icon of the window) in Goh do not all

remain continuously selectable during said simulated rotation. That is, during a portion of the time of the simulated rotation, the target is not selectable by the user.

Thus, Goh does not anticipate Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, 14, 18-19, 23-25, 27, 31-32, 36-38, 40, 44-45, and 49-51 (or the remainder of the pending claims).

Furthermore, Claims 5, 18, 31, and 44 recite "said interface is capable of modifying said targets being displayed on said display in response to a change in focus on content being displayed in another portion of said display".

Goh discloses a user can interact with a computer system by manipulating graphical objects on the display screen using the keyboard and/or the mouse (col. 3, lines 48-50). Goh further discloses windows that can be manipulated independently of that portion of the display screen outside the frame (col. 3, lines 55-57). Goh yet further discloses a window may contain icons which are graphical display objects representing commands, applications, and the like (col. 3, lines 60-62).

Goh does not disclose an interface that is "capable of modifying said targets being displayed on said display in response to a change in focus on content being displayed in another portion of said display".

Thus, Claims 5, 18, 31, and 44 are allowable over Goh for this additional reason.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, 14, 18-19, 23-25, 27, 31-32, 36-38, 40, 44-45, and 49-51 (and the remainder of the Claims) are allowable over Goh.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 20-22, 26, 28-30, 33-35, 39, 41-43, 46-48, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goh, U.S. Patent No. 5,678,015, in view of Matthews, III, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,724,492.

The examiner is kindly reminded that in order to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. MPEP § 2142.

Goh discloses a three dimensional cube having faces in which each face may contain a plurality of icons corresponding to an application. Goh discloses each icon typically represents a command (col. 4, lines 14-25) and is concerned with viewing all icons simultaneously. Each icon in Goh is shown as a simple symbolic feature. There is no disclosure in Goh that the icon has more than one function. The two views of an icon correspond to a frontal view and a backward view looking through the cube.

Matthews teaches a single icon having a plurality of faces for providing functions to an operator using a device having a small display or work area. Matthews teaches a single three dimensional object which tumbles and rotates about an axis (col. 15, lines 15-35). Matthews states "FIG. 6 provides a series of images that illustrate an exemplary open transition, which occurs when the channel manager is activated" (col. 15, lines 15-18). Matthews states "FIG. 11 illustrates a sequence of images that form a part of an exemplary open transition, which occurs when the three-dimensional menu is activated. Generally described, the open transition depicts a three-dimensional menu rotating about its vertical axis as it moves from infinity to its final position on the display" (col. 18, lines 19-24). Matthews states, regarding FIG. 12, "In the preferred hand held computer, three-dimensional animation is used to depict a multi-sided object 1200 rotating from along its vertical axis to reveal another panel" (col. 18, lines 37-40).

Goh discloses a satisfactory solution to a problem to allow a user to see all icons simultaneously (col. 2, lines 26-51). Each icon is associated with a function. Thus, Goh presents an interface in which all available functions are always visible to a user. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Matthews to modify the interface of Goh because Matthews is directed to a single icon that contains all functions, some of which are hidden at any given time. It would be contrary to the spirit of the invention of Goh to be modified by Matthews because Goh seeks to always present all functions visibly to a user and Matthews always keeps hidden at least some of the available functions.

Thus the combination of Goh and Matthews is inappropriate and Goh is not modifiable by Matthews.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 2-4, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 20-22, 26, 28-30, 33-35, 39, 41-43, 46-48, and 52 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2, 3, 15, 16, 28, 29, 41, and 42 are also allowable because they depend from allowable claims 1, 14, 27, and 40.

Furthermore, Claims 4, 17, 30, and 43 recite "said interface is capable of displaying additional information, on at least a portion of said display, associated with a specific target when said cursor is positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary".

This limitation recites "additional information" to be shown when the "cursor is positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary".

Matthews (col. 13, lines 3-23) does not teach the display of "additional information" when the "cursor is positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary".

Instead, Matthews displays text (figs. 7 and 10) regardless of whether the cursor is within any boundary area.

The text of Matthews (col. 14, lines 17-25) cited by the Patent Office discloses a program panel that contains secondary information. The cited text of Matthews does not disclose or suggest ""said interface is capable of displaying additional information, on at least a portion of said display, associated with a specific target when said cursor is positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary".

Thus, claims 4, 17, 30, and 43 are allowable over the prior art of record not only because they depend from allowable independent claims, but also on their own merit.

Claims 7, 20, 33, and 46 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claims 1, 14, 27, and 40.

Furthermore, Claims 7, 20, 33, and 46 recite "said interface is capable of providing focus to a specific target in response to said cursor being positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary".

Goh discloses icons on windows. Neither the icons nor the windows of Goh are disclosed as having hotspot boundaries nor that an interface is capable of providing focus to a specific target in response to said cursor being positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary.

Goh does not disclose or suggest that there is a problem because the icons and windows do not have hotspot boundaries and are not provided focus.

Thus, there is no suggestion or disclosure of a need to modify Goh to provide focus to a specific target in response to said cursor being positioned at least partially within said specific target's hotspot boundary. One of ordinary skill would not look to Matthews to modify Goh with a feature Goh does not express or suggest a need.

Therefore, Claims 7, 20, 33, and 46 are allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 8, 20, 33, and 46 require "said cursor is capable of modifying its presentation into a shape similar to the shape of a specific target which is being given focus by said cursor". Claims 9, 21, 34, and 47 further require that the cursor take on "a shape similar to a miniature version of the shape of said specific target".

Goh discloses icons and windows (col. 3, lines 47-60), but does not disclose or suggest that the cursor assumes the shape of a specific target. Goh does not express or suggest a need for such modification.

Matthews (col. 1, lines 20-67) discloses icons and pull down menus but does not disclose or suggest a cursor which is "capable of modifying its presentation into a shape similar to the shape of a specific target which is being given focus by said cursor" or a miniature version.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 35, 47, and 48 are allowable over the prior art of record because they depend from allowable base claims and for this additional reason.

Claims 13, 26, 39, and 52 are also allowable because they depend from allowable claims 1, 14, 27, and 40.

There is no suggestion or motivation in Goh or Matthews to modify Goh or Matthews or to combine Goh with Matthews. Neither Goh nor Matthews teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the independent claims. Additionally, Goh and Matthews do not teach or suggest limitations found in certain dependent claims as discussed above. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on

applicant's disclosure. Thus, according to MPEP § 2142, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claims 53-76 have been added to further define inventive features of applicant's invention.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-76 are allowable.

The Patent Office is reminded that prior art rejections should ordinarily be confined strictly to the best available art. MPEP 706.02 (page 700-20, left hand column, middle of column)

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and supporting arguments, reconsideration of all pending claims is requested, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

GATEWAY, INC.,

By: _Walter J. Malinowski_

Walter J. Malinowski
Reg. No. 43,423

SUITER & ASSOCIATES PC
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
Telephone   402.496.0300
Facsimile   402.496.0333

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the claims:

1.   (Amended)   A user interface comprising:

a display;

a cursor capable of being displayed on said display;

a cursor control device capable of controlling said cursor's position and movement on said display;

at least two selectable targets displayed on at least a portion of said display; and all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display capable of being simultaneously displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while each one of said all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display remains remaining continuously selectable during said simulated rotation.

14.   (Amended)   A system comprising:

at least one processor;

memory operably associated with said processor; and

a user interface, said user interface comprising

a display;

a cursor capable of being displayed on said display;

a cursor control device capable of controlling said cursor's position and movement on said display;

at least two selectable targets displayed on at least a portion of said display; and all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display capable of being simultaneously displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while each one of said all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display remains remaining continuously selectable during said simulated rotation.

27.	(Amended)	A computer readable medium tangibly embodying a program of instructions capable of implementing the following steps:

displaying at least two selectable targets on at least a portion of a display, <u>all of</u> said at least two selectable targets <u>displayed on said at least a portion of said display</u> capable of being <u>simultaneously</u> displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while <u>each one of said all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display remains</u> ~~remaining~~ continuously selectable during said simulated rotation.

40.	(Amended)	A method comprising the following steps:

displaying at least two selectable targets on at least a portion of a display, <u>all of</u> said at least two selectable targets <u>displayed on said at least a portion of said display</u> capable of being <u>simultaneously</u> displayed in a simulated rotation about an axis while <u>each one of said all of said at least two selectable targets displayed on said at least a portion of said display remains</u> ~~remaining~~ continuously selectable during said simulated rotation.